



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,377	08/27/2003	Joerg Beringer	09282.0007.00000	4602

22852 7590 06/19/2007  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
----------

WEINTROP, ADAM S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/19/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/649,377	Applicant(s) BERINGER, JOERG	
	Examiner Adam S. Weintrop	Art Unit 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10, 12-19, 21-26, and 28-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chandra et al. (US 7,130,885).

Regarding **claim 1**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

A method for facilitating communications among persons in an enterprise, the method comprising:

defining communities within the enterprise (column 30, lines 5-12, where groups are defined from users of a service unit);

Associating collaborative conversation channels with the communities wherein each one of the collaborative conversation channels is associated with a specific one of the defined communities (column 12, lines 51-62, where transportable applications are seen as channels and they are associated with a group of people, seen as a specific community);

providing access to one of the collaborative conversation channels through a user

Art Unit: 2145

interface (column 13, lines 1-2, where a user has access to the transportable application through an inbox, seen as a user interface), with each one of the collaborative conversation channels having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific one of the defined communities (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types, and column 38, lines 49-52, where a user can use any transportable application associated with the group and the transportable applications can correspond to topics as seen in column 90, lines 23-27); receiving, through the user interface, a request to send a message having a selected message type within a selected one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types, and column 21, lines 2-11, where collaboration is done within the transportable application); and sending the message having the selected message type through the selected one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 46, lines 35-37, with the user sending the message).

Regarding **claim 2**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 further comprising: identifying members of a specific community (column 30, lines 5-12, where groups are defined from users of a service unit); and providing the identified members with access to one of the collaborative conversation channels that corresponds to the particular community (column 13, lines 1-2, where a

Art Unit: 2145

user has access to the transportable application, seen as a channel, and these channels correspond to particular communities as seen in column 12, lines 53-57).

Regarding **claim 3**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 wherein each one of the defined community includes members with one of a common fortune or a common interest (column 30, lines 5-12, where groups are defined with users having a common goal).

Regarding **claim 6**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 wherein the set of message types includes predefined message templates (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types that include predefined message templates).

Regarding **claims 7-8**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 wherein users obtain an implicit subscription to a collaborative conversation channel by becoming a member of one of the defined communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 37, lines 35-40, where a user can join a group, and column 45, lines 17-22, where new transportable applications, seen as channels, are sent to groups, and it is seen as if you are a member of a group, you would obtain a subscription to any new messages sent to that group) or based on information in personal user profiles (column 30, lines 5-15, where

Art Unit: 2145

the group membership information is stored in a directory service, seen as a personal user profile, and this controls subscription to groups).

Regarding **claim 10**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 further comprising providing filters for filtering the message received through one of the collaborative conversation channels based on at least one of a community type for one of the defined community communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels, a channel type for one of the collaborative conversation channels, and a community role for members of one of the defined community communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 38, lines 62-65, where filtering based on application type is seen as filtering based on channel type, since channels are seen as transportable applications).

Regarding **claim 12**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 further comprising providing a predefined set of message types based on at least one of a community type for one of the defined community communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels, a channel type for one of the collaborative conversation channels, and a community role for members of one of the defined community communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 24, lines 11-12, with transportable applications based on templates, seen as predefined message types, and transportable

Art Unit: 2145

applications are associated with a specific group as seen in column 38, lines 49-50, this seen as providing the templates based on community type).

Regarding **claim 13**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The method of claim 1 further comprising providing access to a community place for each of the defined communities having collaborative components that are based on a community type for each one of the defined communities, wherein access to one of the collaborative communication channels is provided through the community place (column 37, lines 25-34, with the portal providing access for each defined community, seen as a group, and each group has collaborative components according to the group type, as different transportable applications are going to correspond to different groups as seen in column 37, line 62-column 38, line 5).

Regarding **claim 14**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

A system for supporting collaboration in an enterprise, the system comprising:  
a portal accessible from a plurality of client devices (column 37, lines 18-24); a plurality of enterprise base systems (column 30, lines 5-12, where groups are defined from users of a service unit, seen as multiple enterprise systems); and a collaborative conversation channel application for providing members of a community with access through the portal (column 13, lines 1-2, where a user has access to the transportable application through an inbox) to message templates for a collaborative conversation channel associated with the community, wherein the community relates to a particular topic

Art Unit: 2145

(column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types, and column 38, lines 49-52, where a user can use any transportable application associated with the group and the transportable applications can correspond to topics as seen in column 90, lines 23-27), the message templates allow users to select message types associated with the particular topic (column 24, lines 11-12, with transportable applications based on templates, seen as predefined message types and the transportable applications can correspond to topics as seen in column 90, lines 23-27) and the collaborative conversation channel allows the users to send messages having the selected message type from each of the plurality of client devices to the members of the community using the enterprise base systems (column 46, lines 29-37, with the user sending the message to certain users and groups).

Regarding **claim 15**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 14 wherein the enterprise base systems comprise applications for facilitating communications (column 14, lines 1-15, with the client software enabling communications).

Regarding **claim 16**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 15 wherein the enterprise base systems include a message server for sending messages to the community through the collaborative conversation channel (column 13, lines 45-60, with the client being able to manage messages).



Regarding **claim 17**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 14 wherein the collaborative conversation channel application allows users to list a plurality of available collaborative conversation channels (column 13, lines 1-8, with a client being able to view a list of the transportable applications, seen as channels, as in any standard inbox).

Regarding **claim 18**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 14 wherein the collaborative conversation channel application allows users to search for a collaborative conversation channel (column 39, lines 4-6, where the user can search for transportable applications, seen as channels).

Regarding **claim 19**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 14 wherein the collaborative conversation channel application provides a user interface for display on the client devices (column 37, lines 18-24, with the portal seen as a user interface).

Regarding **claim 21**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 14 wherein messages sent through the collaborative conversation channel are received by members of the community in a message center of the portal (column 37, lines 25-31, where the portal shows messages received).

Regarding **claim 22**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 21 wherein messages received in the message center have an associated icon to indicate the message type (column 59, lines 14-25, where the inbox can include an indication of attachments or other information relating to the message type).

Regarding **claim 23**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 21 wherein each message received in the message center includes an identification of the community to which the message relates (column 36, lines 45-53, where the portal list transportable applications according to group, seen as a community).

Regarding **claim 24**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

The system of claim 14 wherein the collaborative conversation channel filters the sending of messages to each member of the community based on at least one of a community type, a channel type, and a community role for the member (column 38, lines 62-65, where filtering based on application type is seen as filtering based on channel type, since channels are seen as transportable applications).

Regarding **claim 25**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

Art Unit: 2145

An article comprising a machine-readable medium storing instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:

providing access to collaborative conversation channels through a user interface (column 13, lines 1-2, where a user has access to the transportable application through an inbox, seen as a user interface), with each one of the collaborative conversation channels associated with a specific community and having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific community (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types, and column 38, lines 49-52, where a user can use any transportable application associated with the group and the transportable applications can correspond to topics as seen in column 90, lines 23-27);

Receiving, through the user interface, a request to access a template for a selected message type within one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types, and column 21, lines 2-11, where collaboration is done within the transportable application); and

presenting the template for the selected message type through the user interface (column 44, lines 62-65, with the user entering information into the template; seen as presenting the template to the user).

Regarding **claim 26**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

Art Unit: 2145

The article of claim 25 wherein the machine-readable medium stores instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform further operations comprising: receiving user input for the template through the user interface to create a message of the selected message type (column 44, lines 40-65, where user input is used for completing the template); and providing the message to a particular community through the associated collaborative conversation channel (column 45, lines 17-22, where the user can send the message to particular groups, seen as communities).

Regarding **claim 29**, Chandra et al. anticipates:

A method for facilitating communications among persons in an enterprise, the method comprising:

defining communities within the enterprise (column 30, lines 5-12, where groups are defined from users of a service unit);

associating collaborative conversation channels with the communities, with each one of the collaborative conversation channels associated with a specific community (column 12, lines 51-62, where transportable applications are seen as channels and they are associated with a group of people, seen as a specific community);

assigning a set of message types to each one of the collaborative conversation channels (column 24, lines 11-12, where templates are used to create transportable applications, seen as assigning a set of message types to create a channel);

receiving a user selection of a specific message type, which is based on a topic of the

Art Unit: 2145

specific one of the defined communities, for a selected collaborative conversation channel and user input comprising content of a message of the selected message type (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types and the transportable applications can correspond to topics as seen in column 90, lines 23-27, and column 44, lines 40-65, where user input is used for completing the template); and sending the message to members of the specific community associated with the selected collaborative conversation channel (column 45, lines 17-22, where the user can send the message to particular groups, seen as communities).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 4-5, 9, 11, 20, 27-28, and 30-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra et al. (US 7,130,885) in view of Butman et al. (US 5,884,035).

Regarding **claims 4-5**, Chandra et al. anticipates all of the limitations as described above except for constructing the collaborative conversation channels in accordance with at least one generic channel type, or wherein the generic channel type

Art Unit: 2145

is selected from a group consisting of an operational, strategic, or educational channel.

The general concept of choosing a channel type of these types or a generic one is well known in the art as illustrated by Butman et al. Butman et al. teaches choosing a generic channel type (column 18, lines 50-61, where a group can be created and it can be addressed using base or adhoc content, seen as messaging in accordance with at least one generic channel type, since this determines how the information in a channel is routed), and Butman et al. further teaches choosing the generic channel type from a group consisting of an operational channel, a strategic channel, and an educational channel (column 18, lines 54-61, where the content type is seen as the channel type selected for a group, and base is similar to operational since it addresses all users, adhoc is seen as operational since it can be addressed to certain group, this further explained in column 24, lines 40-57, and educational is similar to operational as it addresses all groups as noted in the applicant's specification on page 8, section 0027).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. with using these channel types as taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the dissemination of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

Regarding **claims 9, 20, 27, and 30**, Chandra et al. anticipates all of the limitations as described above except for filtering the message in the channel based on the message type. The general concept of filtering based on message type is well known in the art as illustrated by Butman et al. Butman et al. teaches a messaging system that can filter based on message type (column 22, lines 6-21, where text is

Art Unit: 2145

separated from other files in an object message, which is seen as filtering based on message type). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. with filtering based on message type as taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the replication and publication of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

Regarding **claim 11**, Chandra et al. discloses all of the limitations as described above except pre-configuring the filters based on at least one of a community or community role. The general concept of using pre-configured filters for filtering based on community role is well known in the art as illustrated by Butman et al. Butman et al. teaches that messages can be filtered based on community role of the member (column 19, lines 41-48, where the role of the member controls what level of access the user has to the information, seen as filtering based on community role, are pre-configured roles such as redistributors, administrators, etc.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. with using pre-configured filters for filtering based on role type as taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the dissemination of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

Regarding **claims 28, 31, and 32**, Chandra et al. and Butman et al. disclose all of the limitations as described above except for filtering based on community type and community role of the member as required by claims 28 and 32, or filtering based on a user profile as required by claim 31. The general concept of filtering messages based on community type, community role, or user profile is well known in the art as illustrated

by Butman et al. Butman et al. teaches that messages can be delivered to only certain group types (column 23, lines 53-57, where group type controls what content the group has access to, seen as filtering messages based on group type), and messages can be filtered based on community role of the member (column 19, lines 41-48, where the role of the member controls what level of access the user has to the information, seen as filtering based on community role). This community role is listed in a user profile (column 19, lines 41-60, where the user rights are setup in a group registry for the new user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. with filtering based on group type or role type in a user profile as taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the dissemination of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

Regarding **claim 33**, Chandra et al. and Butman et al. teach all of the limitations as described above with Chandra et al. further teaching automatically associating parameters for the filter based on channel type (column 38, lines 62-65, where filtering based on application type is seen as filtering based on channel type, since channels are seen as transportable applications, and the filter is preconfigured since by using the drop down box to select the filter, the parameters must already be set in order to provide the filter to the user). Chandra et al. does not teach automatically associating filter parameters for filtering based on community type or community role. The general concept of automatically associating filtering parameters for filtering based on community type or community role is well known in the art as illustrated by Butman et al.



Art Unit: 2145

Butman et al. teaches that messages can be delivered to only certain group types (column 23, lines 53-57, where group type controls what content the group as access to, seen as filtering messages based on group type, and the filtering is done as information is received for the group, this being seen as automatically associating filtering parameters since the filter is run for each group as information is received), and messages can be filtered based on community role of the member (column 19, lines 41-48, where the role of the member controls what level of access the user has to the information, seen as filtering based on community role; and these are automatically associated with the filter by assigning the user a role type, the filter is setup accordingly). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. with automatically associating filtering parameters for filtering based on group type or role type as taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the dissemination of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

Regarding **claim 34**, Chandra et al. and Butman et al. teach all of the limitations as described above except for constructing the collaborative conversation channels from an operational or strategic channel. The general concept of choosing a channel type of these types is well known in the art as illustrated by Butman et al. Butman et al. further teaches choosing the channel type from a group consisting of an operational channel or a strategic channel (column 18, lines 54-61, where the content type is seen as the channel type selected for a group, and base is similar to operational since it addresses all users, adhoc is seen an operational since it can be addressed to certain

Art Unit: 2145

group, this further explained in column 24, lines 40-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. and Butman et al. with using these channel types as further taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the dissemination of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

Regarding **claim 35**, Chandra et al. teaches all of the limitations as described above including providing a set of message types based on community type and channel type to a user (column 44, lines 30-35, where a user can access templates for use in a channel, or transportable application, these templates seen as message types based on the specific channel in use, and column 38, lines 49-52, where a user can use any transportable application associated with the group, seen as community type, seen as using a message type based on a community type). Chandra et al. does not disclose providing sets of message types to users based on a role of the member. The general concept of providing message types to users based a member role is well known in the art as illustrated by Butman et al. Butman et al. teaches providing a predefined set of messages to a user based on the user role (column 25, lines 52-53, where the author rights table determines the type of content they can create, seen as the message type a user can use based on the role of the user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chandra et al. with providing message types based on role of the user as taught by Butman et al. in order to increase the level of control over the replication and publication of information as noted in Butman et al.'s disclosure in column 8, lines 28-35.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"SAP Collaboration Room" (Kreyscher) describes a portal system for group collaboration consisting of groups and templates.

"Groupware: Design Issues" (Brinck) describes groupware design consisting of group membership, privacy, sharing, control, and awareness.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam S. Weintrop whose telephone number is 571-270-1604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AW 5/29/07

  
JASON CARDONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER